

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and entry of the above amendments and these remarks are respectfully requested. Claims 14-19 and 22 have been amended. Claims 14-19, 22 and 24 are pending.

Applicants again note that inventors Cohen and Michioka have been removed in the paper filed on September 7, 2004. **Thus, Applicants request the Examiner to change the First Named Inventor to “Pace” in new all papers.**

The Examiner objected to the drawings as not showing every feature claimed. The claims have been amended to remove the features the Examiner considered to not be shown in the drawings. Therefore, the objection should be removed.

Claims 14-18 and 24 are objected to as being in improper form. The multiple dependencies of these claims have been corrected.

Claims 19 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs. Claims 19 and 22 have been revised bearing in mind the Examiner's rejection by removing the subject matter noted by the Examiner. It is submitted that all pending claims are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112. Therefore, the rejections should be withdrawn.

Claims 19 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Naitoh et al. Claims 19 and 22 have been amended to define the invention more clearly and thus, obviate the rejection. In particular, each of claims 19 and 22 recites straight passages between the surface and the fuel outlet with the passages having ends that intersect to form a common seat exit passage at the fuel outlet. Also, the angle of inclination is the same for at least some of the passages.

None of the embodiments of Naitoh et al. disclose ends of passages that intersect to form a common seat exit passage at the fuel outlet. In fact, Naitoh et al. teaches that the fuel should collide at point P, outside of the seat (see column 5, lines 35-55 and column 9-11). Also, as shown in FIG. 2 of Naitoh et al., the inclination angles  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  are different for each passage 12 and 13, respectively. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Regarding Furuya et al. (previously applied to the claims) the passages 8 and 9 of Fig. 2 are not straight and do not intersect.

Claims 14-19 and 22-24 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 13-19 and 22-24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,799,733. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The Examiner contends that the "currently claimed invention is broader than the '733 claims". As a result of the above amendments, Applicant submits that the current claims are not broader than the claims of the '733 patent since the current claims recite straight passages between the surface and the fuel outlet with the passages having ends that intersect to form a common seat exit passage at the fuel outlet and thus these claims are patentably distinct from the claims of the '733 patent. Therefore, the double patenting rejection should be withdrawn.

All rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward J. Stemberger  
Registration No. 36,017  
Attorney for Applicant  
Tel. No. (202) 261-1014

Customer No. 24500